

### **REMARKS**

No claims have been amended or cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Claims 1-44 are pending.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

The Examiner required restriction to either Group I (claim 1-27) or Group II (claim 28-44). Group II is hereby elected with traverse.

Group I and Group II claims correspond respectively to the mirror client and mirror server shown in FIGS. 2, 5A, and 7. There are efficiencies gained in the Patent Office in examining Groups I and II together, as they have corresponding complementary functionality. Moreover, additional fees for independent and dependent claims have been paid such that the examiner of these claims has already been paid for. Thus, the claims in Group I and Group II should be examined together in a single application.

Should the Examiner disagree, Group II is hereby elected with traverse.

#### ***Conclusion***

It is submitted, however, that the independent and dependent claims include other significant and substantial recitations which are not disclosed in the cited references. Thus, the claims are also patentable for additional reasons. However, for economy the additional grounds for patentability are not set forth here.

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned registered practitioner to answer any questions or to discuss steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/608,491  
Amdt. Dated 8/6/2007  
Response to Office action dated 7/10/2007

Date: August 6, 2007

SoCal IP Law Group LLP  
310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120  
Westlake Village, CA 91362  
Telephone: 805/230-1350  
Facsimile: 805/230-1355  
email: info@socalip.com

Respectfully submitted,



---

Mark A. Goldstein,  
Reg. No. 50,759